DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 186 HE 012 586

AUTHOR	Clark, Burton R.
TITLE	Academic Culture.
INSTITUTION	Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Inst. for Social and Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
REPORT NO	YHERG-42
PUB DATE	Mar 80
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Higher Education Research Group, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 1732 Yale Station, New Haven, CT 06520
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization; *College Faculty; Comparative Education; Educational Change; Expectation; *Higher Education; Moral Values; Power Structure; Professors; Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

With fragmentation the dominant trend in academic settings around the world, the larger wholes of profession, enterprise, and system are less held together by integrative ideology. Strong ideological bonding is characteristic of the parts, primarily the disciplines. The larger aggregations are made whole mainly by formal superstructure, many linked levels of bureaucracy from campus administration to multi-campus organs to regional or provincial machinery and up to the national level of administrative and political oversight. Ideologies exist in the superstructure but more as doctrines that loosely legitimate diverse activities than as sets of specific ideas that give commonness to their holders. The newer ideas are broad in scope and necessarily diffuse, stretching over diverse clienteles, programs, and connections to job markets, providing little link with the traditional academic community. This is not the end of ideology in the academic world, but a vast reshaping. Structural changes in education weakened ideologies of the whole while strengthening those of component parts. Academic ideologies serve as an emotional bonding and moral capital, but are increasingly pluralistic, tied to the primacy of the discipline and the profession. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187186

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Yale
Univ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

Institution for Social and Policy Studies

YALE UNIVERSITY

New Haven, Conn. 06520

HE 012 586

ACADEMIC CULTURE

by

Burton R. Clark

YALE HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

WORKING PAPER

YHERG-42

March 1980

Burton R. Clark
Professor of Sociology and Chairman,
Higher Education Research Group

The research reported in this paper has been part of the work conducted by the Yale Higher Education Research Group. It has been supported by research funds from the Lilly Endowment and the Mellon Foundation for the comparative study of academic organization and governance.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Higher Education Research Group reproduces and distributes these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affilitated with the Group. The views expressed are those of the authors.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Seminar on Organizations as Ideological Systems, Swedish Center for Working Life, Stockholm, Sweden, June 11-13, 1979.

A list of the Working Papers of the Group may be obtained from the address below.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
Yale University
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

ACADEMIC CULTURE

All social entities have a symbolic side, a culture as well as a social structure, but in widely varying form and degree. In formal organizations, different structures and technologies give different forms and contents to the beliefs by which people define who they are, what they are doing, and whether they have been blessed or cursed. Such "normative" organizations as churches and non-profit voluntary associations, weak in instrumental rewards and coercive bonds, depend considerably on common beliefs to motivate people and hold everything together, more than do business firms and prisons. But the place of belief is complicated, since there is much variation in ideological strength within any major sector of organizations and much overlap among sectors.

As a general type, academic systems -- those formed in higher education -- are ideologically loaded. They are full of "men of ideas," persons well-known for a certain piety in self-definition that comes from avoiding the crass marketplace while enlisting to serve knowledge, youth, and the general welfare. The purported altruism of one of the oldest professions is brought into play. Hence academic sites can and often do reek with lofty doctrines that elicit emotion in an almost religious fashion. Aided by invited scholars from around the world, the University of Uppsala recently put on a year-long incantation to celebrate its five-hundredth birthday and otherwise bolster the academic spirit. Many small liberal arts colleges in the United States have poignant institutional definitions that provoke emotion to the point where coldly-rational scholars cry at college ceremonies and campus events several times a year.[1] In his book, The Culture of Management,[2] Robert H. Roy even went so far as to maintain that universities are

disintegrative organizations held together by love. The disintegrative part we can readily grasp, since James March and his associates learned and taught about organized anarchies by focusing on universities and colleges,[3] and we all can observe daily the lack of connection between departments of mathematics and history, professional schools of architecture and social work, and research centers of high-energy physics and infant learning. But love? Roy was attempting to go beyond the level of loyalty he thought obtained in firms, unions, and public agencies to denote a more emotional attachment. Much truth lies within the exaggeration of his contrast. As a general class, academic systems have high emotional bonding that, in part, comes from robust ideologies.[4]

To explore why this is the case, I will break academic culture into several parts that are linked to academic structures and suggest how the elements of culture vary as the structures vary. The latter can be done best by pursuing cross-national similarities and differences, even though the pathetic fund of appropriate knowledge provides only treacherous analytical footing. Hence my effort is a cross-national inquiry into academic organizations as ideological systems. As organizations, I include national systems of universities and colleges as well as individual institutions.

FOUR TYPES OF ACADEMIC CULTURE

Academic systems are ideologically rich in part because they provide a plurality of nested groupings each of which manufactures culture as part of its work and self-interest. A German professor of physics partakes of the culture of physics, the culture of the academic profession at large, the culture of the institution where he holds his post, and the culture of the German national academic system. There may be additional sources, such as

political identification and social-class position, but to make systematic sense of the ideologies of academic life we at least need to distinguish the cultures of discipline, profession, enterprise, and system.

THE CULTURE OF THE DISCIPLINE

The more advanced the academic system, the greater the strength of the academic disciplines and professional fields as the basis of organization. The increased specialization that the modern world witnesses in advanced occupations is paralleled by an increased academic division of labor that steadily turns generalists into specialists and specialists into sub-specialists. The specialists are preeminently members of disciplines (and professional fields) and see their departments, chairs, and institutes as parts of disciplines: core units take the names of disciplines, as in the Department of Chemistry and Chair of Political Science. Core membership units encapsulate by discipline, and as sub-disciplines and new disciplines form they are reflected in sub-structures and new structures. Thus, a psychology department in an American research university breaks into sub-departments organized around such major sub-fields as physiological psychology, oriented by the natural science point of view, and personality psychology, oriented toward social science. These same universities give birth to such new departments as biochemistry and computer science that have quickly won acceptance and such fields as women's studies and black studies whose survival is problematic. Modern universities constantly experiment with new disciplines, as new bodies of knowledge or points of view attract supporters who seek a legitimated niche in the basic academic structure.

The discipline has bonding powers that are often stronger than those of

the institution: it is generally less costly to leave the institution than the discipline, since to leave the discipline is to surrender hard-won expertise and identity. The identity of the physicist, the economist, or the historian of art is acquired by socialization into the particular field as a student, the on-the-job socialization of doing one's work and interacting with disciplinary peers, and absorption of the doctrines of the specialty which help to give a sense of place and to define a way of life. To pick up on Thomas Kuhn, the recruits to different academic specialties enter different paradigms, the sharing of beliefs within a field about theory, methodology, techniques, and problems. "A paradigm is what the members of a scientific community share, and conversely, a scientific community consists of men [persons!] who share a paradigm."[5] The culture of the discipline includes idols: the pictures on the walls and on dustjackets of books kept in view are of Albert Einstein and Max Planck and Robert Oppenheimer in the office of the physicist and of Max Weber and Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim in the office of the sociologist. The pictures in the chairman's office line up his or her predecessors, all physicists in the one case, all sociologists in the other, serving as symbols for a sense of department as well as a sense of discipline.

Under the concept of discipline, we need to include the professional specialties which in the beginning and for a long time were primarily medicine, law, and theology, but which have expanded considerably in number in the last century to include such diverse fields as architecture, teaching, and business administration. In the United States, the major types of professional schools are now at least eighteen, including social work, library science, and journalism. Even in Italy, a much less differentiated national system, such fields as pharmacy, engineering, agriculture, and veterinary

medicine are organized as separate Faculties (Facoltá).[6] In the United States, the professional schools are located primarily in the higher tier of a two-tier structure, with entry after the first major degree. But in most countries, the professional schools reside in the first and only significant tier, side by side with the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities, with exclusive membership and usually no lateral transferring of students. Hence even more encapsulation of faculty and students takes place than in the case of American professional schools. In either case, a distinctive medical-school culture, law-school culture, engineering-school culture, etc., is bound to arise, since the schools or faculties reflect the different technologies and work patterns of their respective occupations and the values and norms institutionalized in those fields.[7] The cultures of the many specialties cannot be deduced from general statements about the ethos of the academic profession or the ways of the academic world. Rather the cultures are diversified by the differences in the major occupations to which they are hooked and which they reflect.

Disciplines as well as professional fields use their own forms of organization -- associations, learned societies, academies -- to link together specialists scattered among institutions, issueing formal memberships, encouraging informal and quasi-formal contacts, arranging meetings, and generating a steady flow of symbolic materials.[8] The latter include: stated admission requirements that help set boundaries between insiders and outsiders; reaffirmations of the value and special virtues of the field; reports on how the field as a whole is doing, particularly if it is engaged in delicate relations, and even border warfare, with other fields; prizes and tributes for outstanding performers and tribal elders; sometimes a code of ethics; and always an obituary column, the repetitive honor paid to surviving colleagues. From such materials, and associated activities and rewards, come self-identities

that may be more powerful than those of mate, lover, and family protector, as well as those of community, political party, church, and fraternal order. As the professor comes to care about the welfare of his discipline as well as the advance of his own work, there is little reason to go home at five-o'clock.

But in all such cultural matters, disciplines and professions vary greatly. For example, in consensus on paradigms, fields vary from unified to fragmented cultures. "Social scientists operate in a much less predictable and therefore more anxious environment than physical scientists,"[9] and humanists even less so. Hence social scientists and humanists, disunited within their fields on grounds of basic approach, theory, and methods, are more vulnerable to ideology in the narrower sense of the word, a specific political or worldview brought into one's work from outside sources. In this meaning of ideology, disciplinary cultures vary greatly in degree of openness and vulnerability: very little in mathematics, physics, and chemistry, relatively high in sociology, political science, and history.

THE CULTURE OF THE PROFESSION

The discipline provides a primary culture for academic workers; the academic profession at large, a secondary culture. The culture of the profession provides a general identity referred to by the phrase "academic man," an identity that came to be taken up by professors of biology, sociology, and classics alike. This general culture contains rich ideologies, referred to in such well-known phrases as freedom of research, freedom of teaching, and community of scholars. The culture makes much of personal autonomy and collegial self-government while downgrading bureaucratic controls and forms of "external" supervision. It portrays altruistic commitment on the part of academics generally, as do other professions, for their workers, and can be

quite convincing on the point that academic work is the highest form of service to society -- creating knowledge, transmitting the cultural heritage, training the best of the young to fulfill their highest potential, etc. -- and that full professors have such an exalted role that they should rank in civil-service pay scales with ambassadors and admirals. The culture of the profession contains not only stirring ideological defenses of professional autonomy but also of a professional right to power.

In distinguishing these first two forms of culture, of specific discipline and general profession, it is useful to pick up on a distinction made by Walter Metzger between the ideologies of "academic freedom" and "scientific freedom."[10] These are different species of freedom: "The key differentia is this: academic freedom is the ideology of a profession-across-the-disciplines, the profession created out of the common circumstances of an academic appointment in a college or university and of the common duties and anxieties that this entails; scientific freedom is the ideology of the diverse professions-in-the-discipline, the professions based on the regularized advance of knowledge in distinctive fields." The problems of academic freedom center on restraints in academic institutions, and organized systems thereof, that do or could apply to all, regardless of specialty. In the United States, the specific formulations cultivated by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) attempt mainly to ward off control by institutional trustees and administrators. Here, affirmation and defense take no account of the freedom of similar specialists and researchers who are located outside of academic walls. The problems of scientific freedom center on restraints on work in the discipline, whether inside or outside academic systems -- for example, the freedom of chemists to proceed according to the canons of chemical science whether they work within governmental bureaus,

business firms, non-profit organizations, independent laboratories, or universities and colleges. In the United States, emerging formulations and incidents of perceived abuse of this form of freedom have centered on control by government bureaus rather than control by campus trustees and administrators. Hence, "academic freedom" is an ideological reflection of the problems of the broad academic profession as it is quartered in specific educational institutions. "Scientific freedom" reflects the problems of the specialized scientific fields as they are quartered in both educational and non-educational institutions. In short: the cultures of discipline and academic profession-at-large run on different axes.

THE CULTURE OF THE ENTERPRISE

The third form of academic culture is that which attaches to individual universities and colleges. Such enterprise cultures vary widely in strength as well as content, within national systems and among them. The strength of institutional symbolic bonds is affected by : scale of organization, with unifying ideologies typically stronger in smaller units; tightness of organization, with shared ideology stronger among interdependent parts; organizational age, with historical depth producing a larger storehouse of lore; and the way in which the character of the institution was formed, with dramatic events of birth and transformation producing more heroic symbols than an uneventful institutional life.

In The Distinctive College (1970), a study of the special character of Antioch, Reed, and Swarthmore Colleges in the United States, I devised the concept of organizational saga to point to extreme cases of strong institutional culture.[11] What seemed most important in the evolution of these places over several decades to their special standing among some seven to

eight hundred liberal arts colleges was the working up of a system of belief that was historically grounded in a common effort. No particular program or bit of structure was crucial: all the specific items that are endlessly debated by way of freshman seminars, sequences of courses, senior-year requirements, department versus divisional organization, were not in themselves of any overwhelming importance and could vary almost endlessly. What counted was the integrated meaning assigned to the bits and pieces, the way in which the participants saw their practices as the expression of a unified and unique approach that has been devised by hard work and struggle. It was their belief that counted most, their special sense of an institutional self, a phenomenon that could be referred to as an organizational saga or legend. A good share of the faculty, the students, the administration, and the alumni came to hold in common a credible story of uncommon effort and achievement. The story was not always accurate, since it was highly selective and exaggerated. But it had important ingredients of truth and was based on an historical reality. Thus an organizational saga is a collective understanding of current institutional character that refers to the historical struggle of the group and is embellished and romanticized and loaded with meaning to the point where the organization becomes very much an end-in-itself.

The concept of organizational saga can be used in understanding other colleges and universities and other organizations. The phenomenon can be treated as a matter of degree, ranging along a continuum from zero to one hundred; and, using large categories, we can speak of organizations having sagas in weak, moderate, or strong degree. Even a predominantly pragmatic and instrumental organization probably develops a legendary explanation to some degree, if personnel turnover does not destroy all continuity of group

connection. Those who have worked together for a decade are likely to develop some shared feelings about their organization, a set of beliefs that help to define their place in life and give meaning to the fact of having contributed so much time and effort to a particular institution. The meaning provided by shared symbols gives people additional rewards for having contributed so much of themselves. And, as noted earlier, the broad classes of organizations that we refer to loosely as normative are inclined to stress symbolic bonding. Included are organizations which are forced by the competitive situation in which they find themselves to deliberately promote institutional legends, such as many colleges in the private sector of American higher education. Then, we find organizations ranged along the middle to high parts of the continuum of saga building. There is a strong propensity among American liberal arts colleges to manufacture self-belief: the first pages of the college catalogue speak eloquently to this point, where the story begins with the college sitting on a high hill overlooking a lovely valley, combining rural charm and urban convenience, and goes on to detail the many features that compose a general and attractive uniqueness.

What does this aspect of culture do for academic enterprises? It exacts loyalty and commitment. Faculty do not leave when they have a better material offer, but rather, in remaining, take the "voice" rather than the "exit" choice.[12] A saga-enriched culture also helps to turn the organization into a community, emotionally warming the institution and giving individuals a sense of place. Enterprise community is valuable in modern society, compensating in part for the erosion of geographic community, the fragmentation of group ties, and the rapidity of social change. The inducing of community remains an important reason why colleges and universities appear so often not to be "organizations." Thirdly, full-bodied enterprise ideologies constitute

moral capital, an additional resource for institutional health. Institutions head into troubled times with quite different characterological abilities to survive and be strengthened by crisis. Financial capital helps, but, in addition, peoples' depth of belief in the value of the institution makes a difference in response in the days of illness and decline. For example: the troubled days of student protest in the late 1960s hit American colleges quite differently according to their characters. Some that were weak in self-belief and quite fragmented were severely ripped apart, e.g., San Francisco State College. Others that had strong self-belief, and were relatively united around it, went through extremely troublesome days but were able to snap back relatively rapidly and to feel that they had been made all the stronger by the common experience of working their way out of the troubled waters, e.g. Wesleyan University.[13] A saga, or any potent institutional myth, is a resource deposited in the bank of institutional morality as an account on which one can draw without going bust when turndowns occur, as in the economics turndown of the 1970s.

Lastly, a sturdy institutional belief serves as a bridge to the outside world across which resources flow. Especially in competitive arenas, the institution that believes deeply in itself, and has at least a small social base of believers on the outside, has some advantage in raising funds and attracting clientele and personnel. The belief is an institutional reputation as well as a self-image. Reputation is important in nearly all sectors of organizational life but especially in those realms where resources must be "privately" assembled.

Intense enterprise ideologies have their disadvantages. As seen in the academic world, they center in a narrowing of commitment and a loss of adaptability. The first is the hazard of the specialized niche in the

ecology of similar organizations. Organizations diversify as a way of hedging one's bets, of protecting the viability of an organization against sudden changes in the environment that might make any one function or style obsolete. If one chooses the path of claiming a narrowly-specified unique role, then one must live with the hazard of putting all of the eggs in one basket, unable to flexibly orchestrate a set of roles, emphasizing first one and then another as environmental change suggests a shift in commitments. A saga generally freezes priorities, although the content of the saga can make a difference in the degree of rigidity. For example, the self-belief of Antioch College has been more open than the Reed one to experimentation and even structural change, since from the beginning it has encouraged nontraditional actions.

Loss of adaptability is obviously entailed as institutional self-love hardens around a particular competence. The specialist institution is particularly surrounded with its own trained incapacities when it is full of pride about its distinctive accomplishment and is publicly perceived as especially good at a particular thing. Competence is then narrowly staked, with tradition, vested interest, and ideology helping to ensure that any shift to new duties and points of view will be a wrenching and sometimes impossible business. An intense sense of craft may be a great thing, until an organization wants to shift from one craft to another or transform craft workers into assembly-line workers. This is generally so hard to do that it is preferably done by turnover of personnel rather than by exhortation and retraining of existing staff. But then personnel turnover is not possible where academic tenure, civil service position, or union rights provide job protection. A tenured senior faculty highly competent in a collegiate specialized task and carrying a unified belief about a distinctive role can

be unshakable. It is not easy to induce those who, over two to three decades of hard work, have developed an intense commitment to a particular interpretation of the liberal arts to change their minds in the course of five or ten years to a quite different definition.

In public sectors of higher education, in the American system and even more so elsewhere, zealous pursuit of special organizational character is often deliberately avoided. The public enterprises need the internal diversity that allows them to relate to many publics.
The state may mandate similiarity across a set
of institutions, or institutions may voluntarily converge on prestigious models or make common cause with sister institutions in a system to avoid risking their revenge on a prideful deviant who asserts his or her difference. Yet, even in state-supported sectors, this "safe" game has its own set of dangers. When a general turndown occurs, the nondistinctive institution has no special claim on resources other than a fixed place in the budget. As a duplicate part, interchangeable with other parts of the system, it may be the redundant unit selected by budget cutters for major surgery or a bankruptcy sale. Various public authorities may even be inclined to attempt to plan for diversity among the enterprises of a state system, and therefore to reward those campuses that reach for distinctiveness rather than remain in a comfortable uniformity.

The structural feature that apparently has most effect in determining the nature and strength of enterprise cultures in higher education is the tightness of organization. American universities are more loosely integrated than are American colleges because they incorporate more of the fragmented professionalism of the disciplines that was earlier noted. In turn, European and Latin American universities are even more loosely integrated than are

their American counterparts, since the individual Faculties are traditionally highly autonomous within them, requiring little or no lateral linkage, making "the university" heavily confederational and often an entity in name only. Faculties scatter physically around a city, since their interdependence is so low that they do not need to be geographic neighbors; campus bureaucrats are few in number and weak in power compared to British and especially American counterparts; and campus trustees do not exist. From the respective degree of structural fragmentation comes cultural fragmentation. Within the state of Ohio, one does not expect Ohio State University to have the symbolic unity of Antioch College or Oberlin College. In the multiversity, sagas having to do with academic valor are likely to develop in professional schools or departments rather than for the whole enterprise. In the United States, enterprise sagas for large universities are now chiefly produced by athletic valor, extracurricular symbols that compensate for the curricular fragmentation and give wholeness and magnetism to enterprises that need to compete for attention, affection, and support from external sources. In Europe, Faculties are entrenched segmental items in state budgets. In many cases, support runs directly from Ministry to Faculty, passing only routinely through University offices on its way to Faculties. Buildings and personnel are sunk costs in national budgets. Hence the need for symbolic bonding at the enterprise level is much less than in the U.S. In most countries, sheer age is likely to be the main source of hallowed symbols and of the sense of continuity of ideals and activities that comes from the stone and mortar of bygone centuries -- the sensing of institutional roots that is hard to come by on the new campus of the 1960s, whether constructed of plate-glass or cement-block. Elders in the institutional tribe are likely to have more academic culture than the young, having extracted symbols from experience over a longer time and

solidified ideologies that legitimate position and power.

THE CULTURE OF THE SYSTEM

As we scrutinize national systems, we can observe features of academic belief and related styles of behavior which do not stem from the cultures of discipline, profession, and enterprise, but rather in major part have their sources in the larger national context or in the way the system as a whole has been traditionally organized. For example: Italian academic life is known for arbitrary behavior by chairholding professors. There, the personalism and particularism that inheres in Chair systems of academic organization has been magnified over time as senior professors, through a number of mechanisms, translated local power into national power.[14] Baronial rule at national as well as local levels has been aided by a number of ideological props that have legitimated for an academic elite the right to rule. At least four sets of beliefs have contributed to a sustaining conception: the nineteenth and early-twentieth-century Liberal tradition of elite leadership, with highly restricted franchise, give sanction in all walks of Italian life to rule by a few eminent personalities; an administrative tradition of a state monopoly of "the public interest" made senior civil servants, including senior professors, the appropriate custodians of various slices of government; the Crocean tradition -- the "historical idealism" of Benedetto Croce -- in Italian philosophy and culture, deemphasizing narrow training and the scientific method, socialized professors as well as others to the view that broadly-educated men strong in intuition and spirit were destined to lead, serving society as they boldly used the authority of high office; and, the conception of the university as a place where professors know best led straight on to the conception that the university first serves the professor

and his needs and only secondarily the student and then as an apprentice to the master. Such converging traditions became a general rationale, an unspoken presumption, for oligarchical control by this particular professional group.

As a second example: Polish academic life is known for the very high respect granted in society to academic intellectuals, putting professors at the top of the scale of occupational prestige.[15] This highly-desirable standing has its roots in the history of the struggle during the recent centuries to have a Polish nation, to simultaneously get rid of the Austrians and the Russians and the Germans. In the absence of statehood, Polish identity -- a sense of Poland -- was carried over a long time by the intellectuals as well as the Catholic Church. Hence the intellectuals as well as the Church have stood in respect, closer to the core of "nationhood" than in most other societies. Here the strength of a group does not lie in the possession of production tools, armaments, state office, or even religious devotion, but in a widespread and deeply-rooted respect rooted in the symbols of freedom and nation. There is a Polish tradition in higher education which is not a simple derivative of the cultures of discipline, profession, and enterprise.

In less striking but important form, national systems of higher education seem to vary significantly in such cultural contents as scientific versus humanistic, narrow versus comprehensive coverage, pure scholarship versus pragmatic application. Thus, it seems to make some sense to contrast the German and Italian systems of the first half of this century as relatively scientific and relatively humanistic; to suggest that the Belgian system has remained with a traditional, limited scope more than the American; and to assert that the Soviet system is more oriented to practical application

than is the British. In a recent book that compares higher education in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, on the five "functions" of professional education, general education, research, social criticism, and social justice, Joseph Ben-David makes some headway in characterizing comparatively the overall orientations of national systems.[16] For example, he suggests structural reasons why general higher education has been even more "abandoned" in other major countries than in the United States. But such general formulations have to be carefully made or else they readily slide off into national stereotypes. They also cause us to underestimate the variety which lies within national systems, even the nominally-uniform ones. Statements of central tendency in the structure and culture of national systems become evermore misleading as systems differentiate internally, becoming more loosely coupled at the base even while superstructures of formal coordination are more firmly constructed. Which brings us to the basic trend of fragmentation.

THE PROLIFERATION AND FRAGMENTATION OF ACADEMIC CULTURE

The basic trend in academic culture is fragmentation brought about by a proliferation of parts that operate under the centrifugal force of a growing number of differing needs and interests. The proliferation proceeds along three main avenues: increased specialization in discipline, role, and sector.

I earlier took note of increased disciplinary specialization as a basic force in the dividing of academic cultures. The cultural distance between disciplines increases steadily: if the members of the classics clan think that the nearby sociology tribe has a strange culture, they have not seen anything yet, for over in the emerging department of computer science, the

general style is even stranger. As such new fields as bio-physics, linguistics, environmental studies, and urban studies multiply, subculturing proceeds apace, with each discipline delimiting its tenets of thought around certain facets of reality and adopting its own ways of viewing the world. On the grounds alone of disciplinary subculture we will go on having an ever harder time understanding one another within academia.

Increased role specialization within institutions is the second basic force. Not only do separate student, faculty, and administrative cultures form as the respective roles separate further from one another, but important differentiation also takes place within each. Student culture has been studied somewhat intensively in a large body of research on students' attitudes and values. Based on a fourfold classification of the two dimensions of orientation to ideas and orientation to one's institution, the most widely used typology has pointed to four general types of student culture: the academic, the vocational, the collegiate -- Joe College himself -- and the non-conformist.[17] Even using as many as four types is not enough, in such a heterogeneous system as the American, since among 10 million students that are quite different ways of being academic -- from premature Don to passive grade-grubber -- or being vocational or collegiate or non-conformist in basic campus outlook. In turn, faculty culture is not only importantly and increasingly different from student culture but is also increasingly segmented internally. Within enterprises, as in the American state university, subcultures in the faculty form around primary commitments to research, scholarly teaching, professional training, and outside consulting.[18] In pure form, we have the mad academic scientist who locks himself in his laboratory, the Mr. Chips who disdains specialization and devotes his life to chatting up undergraduates, the academic dentist who checks the drillings of the students, and the

professor of business, education, or engineering who spends so much time consulting outside the university that new rules must be enacted to insure his or her presence some of the time. Rumor has it that even Sweden has one or two embodiments of this latter type! These four types elaborate the old local-cosmopolitan distinction by crossing it with the pure-applied distinction to give two kinds of locals, the "disinterested" teacher-scholar and the practical professional of the professional schools, and two types of cosmopolitans, the researcher and the consultant. In addition, in a good share of the systems of the world, notably in the Mediterranean countries and Latin America, many faculty are not full-time, but rather have their primary base in outside work and come into the university on occasion, at their own discretion. This widens the differences between cosmopolitans and locals, since we then must add a type of reverse cosmopolitan for whom the academic enterprise is not even the primary basis of job identification.

Least noticed in the internal cultures of academic enterprises and systems has been the separation of administrative cultures from those of faculty and students as big administration replaced small administration. As cadres of professional experts replace the professor-amateur, in campus administration, state or provincial administration, and national administration, a separate set of roles and interests emerge around which separate definitions of the situation form. This phenomenon has been best identified in the United States in studies of the University of California, where, in addition to large campus administrations, there has existed a rapidly-growing state-wide administration over and above the nine campuses of a multi-campus system. Grouped in a separate building in Berkeley, the senior experts in this cluster, who together with supporting staff numbered over 1200 persons in the mid-1970s,[19] interact largely with one another, have daily role

mandates radically different from teaching and research, increasingly do not come from faculty ranks, and have ample reason to see professors and students as, at best, lacking in understanding, and, at worst, troublemakers and enemies. A separate culture is generated. As put by Lunsford:

> University executives and faculty members are increasingly isolated from each other in their daily lives, while each is encouraged toward contacts mainly with their own "kind." ... On many large campuses, a dozen or so high-level administrators meet regularly in an "administrative council," sharing perspectives on specific problems of university management .... Increasingly, also, university officials meet their opposite numbers in other institutions away from their campuses, at meetings of the many regional and national boards, commissions, advisory councils, interuniversity groups, and "professional" associations of administrative specialties. Literally scores of voluntary groups are peopled principally by campus administrators. Their meetings are at once Rotary conventions and "scholarly" conferences for the participants. Some of the administrative specialty groups work deliberately in these sessions to develop "professional" identities, and foster self-conscious sharing of "expertise" or "viewpoints" on problems typically met by their members.

With all this, general symbolic separateness grows, as other groups in the university see "the Administration" as a distinct and even alien segment. In response, administrators cope in part by becoming specialists in creating and spreading official ideologies. "They themselves have special needs for those 'socially integrating myths' that help to hold the loosely coordinated organization together and give its members 'a sense of mission.'"[21]

In most countries of the world, administrative culture has developed primarily at the national level, since overhead services have been located in the national ministry of education or some other national office. Such offices can be small and amateurish and well-integrated with the understructure, rotating a few professors in and out of dusty, sleepy quarters, but they can and do grow rapidly and are forced to professionalize rapidly as education becomes big business. Thus, even small and homogeneous Sweden moved from a half-dozen officials attending to higher education in central offices in the mid-1940s to about two hundred in the mid-1970s.[22] And even Britain, long a model of amateur professorial control in the form of the University Grants Committee, has enlarged the relevant administrative staff from about six in the early 1950s to over 140 in 1975.[23] In systems that have long had major national ministries or departments of education, central staffs are known for their encapsulation as well as large size, with attention possessed by the day-to-day demands of office and attitudes heavily conditioned by the administrative culture that accumulates as a legacy of efforts over decades to grapple with those demands, whether in France or Mexico or Thailand. Thus, one important distinction among academic administrative cultures is between those which help administrators define their situation at the enterprise level and those that provide definitions at system-wide levels. The first typically takes the point of view of the enterprise, which generally includes autonomy within the system, while the second is necessarily imbued with the requirements of regional and national linkages, the canons of fairness across institutions, and the need to operate in arenas where national public administration meets national politics.

Increased segmentation of institutional sectors is the third major source of fragmentation in academic cultures. Universities and colleges that are

committed to different institutional roles within a system have different assortments of student, faculty, and administrative subcultures. The institutional roles may be defined explicitly in a formal separation of sectors, as in a binary policy or a tripartite master plan, or reside implicitly in the actual character and practice of a set of enterprises, often to the contrary of formal labels. For example: nearly everywhere, the public interest in equity induces systems to adopt common labels, as in the generous distribution of the name "university" to colleges that do not give the Ph.D., and to vocational-training schools, and to professionally-specialized faculties limited to a single field or to such limited combinations as law and pharmacy, teaching and agriculture. But with an ever expanding division of labor in the understructure, the common labels simply give a certain useful pretense of commonness and similarity to parts that are fundamentally unlike.

In any case, such major institutional sectors are research universities and community colleges in the United States, grandes écoles and universities in France, and Oxbridge and teacher training colleges in Great Britain, develop different faculty orientations. They do so through recruitment, in which enterprises select for value orientations as well as types of expertise appropriate for their general character; by means of interpersonal socialization, in which experienced hands orient the newcomers, informally and often unconsciously as well as formally and deliberately; and work socialization, in which the demands, pressures, and rewards of the job cause personnel to assume a point of view. Expectations are adjusted to the mix of institutional tasks. In the United States, there are vast differences across the many sectors, where, for example, teaching loads vary from about 4-6 hours a week in research universities to 12, 15, 18 and 20 hours-a-week in some service universities, state colleges, the poorer liberal arts colleges, and especially

the community colleges.[24] Over four-fifths of American faculty and students are in locales where little or no research is done, with rewards oriented strongly to teaching, counseling, and service. The American community college presses hard on its personnel for a total commitment to teaching and student counseling, setting its face against the cosmopolitan orientations of research and professional consulting. Here, the Teacher and the Demonstrator are the major alternative orientations of the faculty, with the academic-vocational schism the critical cleavage. This type of colleges seeks both the pure academic teacher and the more practical person who can show apprentices "how-to-do-it" in short-term occupational training. It is representative of the newer sectors in mass higher education in many countries in which the institutional culture is vastly different from that idealized in the Germany university of the nineteenth century and the modern research university.

Against the basic trend of specialization and fragmentation there are counterforces that offer modest integration. As systems move from elite to mass higher education -- from less than five per cent to twenty per cent or more of the age group -- they develop a need to differentiate internally, vertically as well as horizontally, to accommodate an increasingly heterogeneous clientele, to connect to more varied job markets, and to reconcile mass entry with selection to the highest forms of specialization. One general tendency is to develop a first tier of a year or two devoted to general knowledge and orientation, which screens for admission to higher levels. This lower tier may be organized in part as a separate sector, e.g., the American two-year college, or within a dominant, embracing sector, e.g., the first cycle of the three cycles of the French university. Here, in many cases, the specialist is despecialized and made a generalist again. The sociologist covers much if not all of sociology in a general fashion, since

he teaches only introductory courses. Indeed, he may be asked to do some psychology and some anthropology, becoming as interdisciplinary and broad in subject cover as a secondary-school teacher in the social sciences. Anyone who concentrates his or her energies in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the educational sequence is likely to develop orientations more similar to those who teach in the preceeding eleventh and twelfth years than those who concentrate their work in the "graduate school" years, especially if the first has a unselective clientele and the second has a selective one and the first is innocent of research and the second centers on research. Thus, the burdens of mass higher education do induce some return to the generalist and to subcultures that bridge between the more general training of lower education and the many proliferating and narrower specialties of higher education.

CONCLUSION

With fragmentation the dominant trend in academic settings around the world, the larger wholes of profession, enterprise, and system are less held together by integrative ideology. Strong ideological bonding is characteristic of the parts, primarily the disciplines. The larger aggregations are made whole mainly by formal superstructure, the many linked levels of bureaucratic bonding that stretch from campus administration to multi-campus organs to regional or provincial machinery and up the line to the national level of administrative and political oversight. Ideologies exist at the levels of the superstructure but more as doctrines that loosely legitimate diverse activities than as sets of specific ideas that give commonness to holders. For example, we may speak of an ideology of mass higher education, connected to the whole of a national system, in which such broad ideas as

equality of educational opportunity and human-capital development are central elements,[25] as over against a former ideology of elite higher education in which these ideas were subdued and, instead, conceptions of excellence and elite preparation helped legitimate academic work. The newer ideas are broader in scope and inherently diffuse, serving as blankets stretched over diverse clienteles, programs, and connections to job markets. They hardly make us members of what was often called in the past, with some justification, the academic community.

Is this, then, the end of ideology in the academic world? It is not the end but a vast reshaping. A long but generally slow trend of increasing size, complexity, and specialization in academic systems was accelerated considerably in recent bursts of expansion. The structural changes weakened ideologies of the whole while strengthening those of the many segments. It is still the case that academic ideologies may be seen as a form of emotional bonding and even of moral capital for all the many levels of organization in higher education -- a relatively strong form compared to that found in most non-academic organizations. But the intangible bonds of symbol, emotion, and morality are evermore pluralistic, tied to the primacy of the discipline and the profession. Integrated academic culture becomes the many cultures of the conglomeration.

NOTES

[1] Burton R. Clark, The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

[2] Robert H. Roy, The Culture of Management. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970. Ch. 6, "Academic and Other Organizations." Especially p. 89.

[3] Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974; James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

[4] Among five types of organizational bonds -- emotional, moral, the expedient, habitual, and physical -- Herbert Kaufman has suggested that emotional bonds are probably the strongest ones. Those bonds are forged by "love" of "a common symbol and/or a common idea" as well as by love of a common leader or of all be each. Herbert Kaufman, The Limits of Organizational Change. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1971. Pp. 116-118.

[5] Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Second Edition, Enlarged. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 176; and Janice Beyer Lodahl and Gerald Gordon, "The Structure of Scientific Fields and the Functioning of University Graduate Departments," American Sociological Review, Vol. 37, 1972, pp. 57-72.

[6] Burton R. Clark, Academic Power in Italy: Bureaucracy and Oligarchy in a National University System. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977. Ch. 1, "University."

[7] Cf. Howard Becker, Blanche Geer, Everett C. Hughes, and Anselm L. Strauss, Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

[8] In the United States, the number of discipline-oriented associations, including learned societies, had grown to approximately 300 by the late 1960s, organized around not only such major disciplines as physics, economics, and English, but also the specialties indicated by such titles as American Association of Teacher Education in Agriculture, American Folklore Society, Psychometric Society, and Society for Italian Historical Studies. Harland G. Bloland, Higher Education Associations in a Decentralized Education System. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1979, pp. 176-183. See also Harland G. Bloland and Sue M. Bloland, American Learned Societies in Transition: The Impact of Dissent and Recession. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.

[9] Lodahl and Gordon, op. cit., p. 70.

[10] Walter P. Metzger, "Academic Freedom and Scientific Freedom," Daedalus, Vol. 107, No. 2, Spring 1978, pp. 93-114. Quotation, p. 107.

[11] Burton R. Clark, The Distinctive College, 1970. Ch. 10, "The Making of an Organizational Saga"; Burton R. Clark, "The Organizational Saga in Higher Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 17, 1972, pp. 178-183.

[12] Albert O. Hirschman, Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.

[13] Burton R. Clark, "The Wesleyan Story: The Important of Moral Capital," in Academic Transformation: Seventeen Institutions Under Pressure, edited by David Riesman and Verne A. Stadtman. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973, pp. 367-381.

[14] Burton R. Clark, Academic Power in Italy, 1977. Ch. 3, "Oligarchy."

[15] Cf. Jan Szczepanski, Systems of Higher Education: Poland. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978, pp. 1-3; Aleksander Matejko, "Planning and Tradition in Polish Higher Education," Minerva, Vol. VII, No. 4, Summer 1969, pp. 621-648, especially p. 633.

[16] Joseph Ben-David, Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany, United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1977.

[17] Burton R. Clark and Martin A. Trow, "The Organizational Context," in Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson (eds.), College Peer Groups.

Chicago: Aldine, 1966, pp. 17-70; Kaoru Yamamoto (ed.), The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

[18] Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Culture," in The Study of Campus Cultures, edited by Terry F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963, pp. 39-54.

[19] T. R. McConnell and Stewart Edelstein, Campus Governance at Berkeley: A Study in Jurisdictions. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1977, pp. 4-5.

[20] Terry F. Lunsford, "Authority and Ideology in the Administered University," in Carlos E. Kruytbosch and Sheldon L. Messinger (eds.), The State of the University: Authority and Change. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1970, pp. 87-107. Quotations, pp. 91-92.

[21] Lunsford, op. cit., p. 101. For an early statement of the general use of such myths, see Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1957, pp. 151-52.

[22] Rune Premfors and Bertil Ostergren, Systems of Higher Education: Sweden. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1978, pp. 23-25.

[23] John Vaisey, "Higher Education Planning," in Barbara B. Burn, Higher Education and the Current Crises. New York: International Council

for Educational Development, 1975, pp. 191-98.

[24] Oliver Fulton and Martin Trow, "Research Activity in American Higher Education," in Martin Trow (ed.), Teachers and Students. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, pp. 39-83.

[25] Roger L. Geiger, "Two Paths to Mass Higher Education: Issues and Outcomes in Belgium and France," Yale Higher Education Research Group Working Paper No. 34, 1979.

INSTITUTION FOR SOCIAL AND POLICY STUDIES

The mission of the Institution for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) is to encourage and undertake multidisciplinary research and education. The ISPS is oriented to the exploration of social problems rather than to the refinement of discipline-based methodology. In recent years, ISPS research has focused on the problems of the city, education, health service delivery, and on the modeling of social systems. Currently, research is also being developed on criminal justice, governmental reform, environment, income distribution, aging, the policy-making process, and value problems in public policy. ISPS is not a consulting organization but an instrument for enriching the social sciences and related disciplines in the University.

Higher Education Research Group
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520